



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,597	07/28/2003	Alton W. Hezeltine	884.413US2	4627
21186	7590	03/21/2006	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH 1600 TCF TOWER 121 SOUTH EIGHT STREET MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			CHUKWURAH, NATHANIEL C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3721	

DATE MAILED: 03/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

e

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/628,597	HEZELTINE, ALTON W.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nathaniel C. Chukwurah	3721	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 July 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/28/2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's arguments, see remark/argument, filed 1/9/2006, with respect to 102(e) rejection have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 102(e) rejection of claims 1-30 has been withdrawn.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-8, 10 and 11 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10, respectively, of U.S. Patent No. 6,622,802. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims differ merely in the scope of the subject matter claimed; i.e. claims 1-8, 10 and 11 are substantially included in the claims 1-10, respectively, of the US Patent No. 6,622,802, but omit the feature non-critical to patentability, for example, a vacuum element couple to the chamber to retract the piston. They are not patentably distinct from each

Art Unit: 3721

other because the claims of the present application are made broader than the specifics of the claims of the Patent, which anticipate broader claims of the application.

Claims 9, 20 and 29 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 11 and 21, respectively, of U.S. Patent No. 6,622,802. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims differ merely in the scope of the subject matter claimed; i.e. claims 9, 20 and 29 are substantially included in the claims 1, 11 and 21, respectively, of the US Patent No. 6,622,802, but omit the feature non-critical to patentability, for example, a vacuum element couple to vacuum generator wherein the vacuum element is coupled to the chamber to retract the piston. They are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the present application are made broader than the specifics of the claims of the Patent, which anticipate broader claims of the application.

Claim 17 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,622,802. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims differ merely in the scope of the subject matter claimed; i.e. claim 17 is substantially included in the claim 16 of the US Patent No. 6,622,802, but omit the feature non-critical to patentability, for example, a vacuum element couple to vacuum generator wherein the vacuum element is coupled to the chamber to retract the piston. It is not patentably distinct from each

Art Unit: 3721

other because the claims of the present application are made broader than the specifics of the claims of the Patent, which anticipate broader claims of the application.

Claims 12-16, 18, 19, 21 and 22 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 11-15 and 17-20, respectively, of U.S. Patent No. 6,622,802. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims differ merely in the scope of the subject matter claimed; i.e. claims 12-16, 20 and 21 are substantially included in the claims 11-15, 19 and 20, respectively, of the US Patent No. 6,622,802, but omit the feature non-critical to patentability, for example, a vacuum element couple to the chamber to retract the piston. They are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the present application are made broader than the specifics of the claims of the Patent, which anticipate broader claims of the application.

Claims 23-28 and 30 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 21-27, respectively, of U.S. Patent No. 6,622,802. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims differ merely in the scope of the subject matter claimed; i.e. claims 23-25 and 27-30 are substantially included in the claims 21-23 and 25-27 of the US Patent No. 6,622,802, but omit the feature non-critical to patentability, for example, a vacuum element couple to the chamber to retract the piston. They are not patentably distinct from each

Art Unit: 3721

other because the claims of the present application are made broader than the specifics of the specifics of the claims of the Patent, which anticipate broader claims of the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 12-16, 21 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka (US 5,437,339) in view of Maier et al. (US 4,213,301).

Tanaka discloses a tool comprising: a body (1) having chamber, a piston (2) within the chamber, a nose (4) having a channel, a pin (3) within the channel, a propulsion element (27) to propel the piston, an actuation element (31) to actuate the propulsion element. The channel is dimensioned to retain a fastener until the propulsion element is actuated as evidenced in Figure 2. The piston (2) has more mass than the pin as shown in Figure 1. Tanaka further discloses at least one resilient bumper (5), a depressible actuation element (31), a primary hammer (7), a secondary hammer (2) having a pin (3) and the primary hammer has more mass than the secondary hammer as shown in Figure 1.

Tanaka lacks a pin physically independent of the piston. However, Maier et al. discloses similar tool including a pin (5) within a channel and physically independent of the piston (13).

In view of the teachings of Maier et al., it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the tool of Tanaka with a pin physically independent of the piston in order to move

Art Unit: 3721

more effectively within the channel to strike workpiece. Although Tanaka does not disclose a tip adapter, tip adapter is well known in fastener driving tool to accommodate nails of different dimension and would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the tool of Tanaka with a tip adapter to more effectively accommodate nails of different dimension.

Claims 11, 22 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka in view of Maier et al. as applied to claims 1, 12 and 23 and further in view of Lindsay (US 6,095,256).

Modified Tanaka lacks a supply hose connection and a pilot hose connection to couple to a supply hose and a pilot hose, respectively.

However, Lindsay teaches a supply hose connection (116) and a pilot hose connection (114) to couple to a supply hose and a pilot hose, providing vacuum and air pressure in the supply hose and pilot hose, respectively, in order not to depend on a spring for the piston's return or impact stroke (col. 2, lines 58-60).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/9/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to claim 1, 12 and 23, applicant argues that neither Tanaka nor Maier discloses a propulsion element or air delivery infrastructure to propel the piston pin.

The Examiner disagrees with applicant because Tanaka discloses an air delivery infrastructure as described, for example, " The compressed air supplied into the cylinder assembly drives impulsion piston (2) downwardly so that the driver (3) coupled to the lower end

Art Unit: 3721

of the impulsion piston (2) drives a nail from the nose member (3) into a wooden plate” (col. 5, lines 38-43). Further, Maier discloses an air delivery infrastructure as described in column 6, lines 37-68; column 7, lines 1-45 which propels the primary hammer (13c) and against the secondary hammer (5).

With respect claim 23, applicant argues that asserted combination of Tanaka in view of Maier and Lindsay fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitation present in independent claims 1, 12 and 23.

The Examiner disagrees with applicant because Tanaka and Maier disclose an air delivery infrastructure as described above; and Lindsay was used to teach a supply hose connection (116) and a pilot hose connection (114) to couple to a supply hose and a pilot hose, providing vacuum and air pressure in the supply hose and pilot hose, respectively which meet claim limitation.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 3721

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathaniel C. Chukwurah whose telephone number is (571) 272-4457. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00AM-2:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi Rada can be reached on (571) 272-4467. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NC

March 17, 2006.



Rinaldi I. Rada
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700